

## MINUTES ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL

Greenville, NC  
September 8, 2003

The Greenville City Council met in a regular meeting on the above date at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers, third floor of the Municipal Building, with Mayor Robert D. Parrott presiding. The meeting was called to order, followed by the invocation by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller and the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The following were present.

Mayor Robert D. Parrott  
Mayor Pro-Tem Ric Miller  
Council Member Mildred A. Council  
Council Member Ray Craft  
Council Member Pat Dunn  
Council Member Rose H. Glover  
Council Member Chip Little  
Marvin W. Davis, City Manager  
Wanda T. Elks, City Clerk  
David A. Holec, City Attorney

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

City Manager Davis announced that a request had been made to continue until November 13 the rezoning request by Martina Bainbridge, President of the Yorkshire Village Homeowners Association, to rezone two tracts of property owned by Linda Perry and Jean Averette.

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller to continue the rezoning request made by Martina Bainbridge, President of the Yorkshire Village Homeowners Association, until November 13, 2003. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Council Member Council and seconded by Council Member Glover to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

### APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA - APPROVED

Motion was made by Council Member Council and seconded by Council Member Glover to approve all the items under the consent agenda as listed below. Motion carried unanimously.

- (1) Minutes of August 11 and August 14, 2003 City Council meetings
- (2) Consideration of various tax refunds

<u>Name</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Ruth Laughinghouse Ward	Taxpayer should have received the Old Age Exemption	\$ 120.54
Overton's, Inc.	Airplane hanger charged on incorrect account	\$1,342.18

	Maybell Edwards Whitehurst	Mobile Home charged in city limits in error	\$ 150.46
	Rachael Lynn Brady	Prorate taxes on vehicle	\$ 123.99
(3)	Ordinance installing new stop signs at various locations (Ordinance No. 03-83)		
(4)	Ordinance installing four-way stop signs at intersection of Maple Street and East Sixth Street (Ordinance No. 03-84)		
(5)	Ordinance establishing “No Parking” zone on east side of Lawrence Street (Ordinance No. 03-85)		
(6)	Ordinance establishing subdivision-wide speed limit of 25 MPH in Summerfield neighborhood (Ordinance No. 03-86)		

### DISCUSSION OF REQUEST TO CONSIDER “SLOTING” OF PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Merrill Flood, Deputy Director of Planning and Community Development, informed the Council that in response to a request made by George Hamilton at the August meeting, staff has investigated the possibility of slotting the positions for Planning and Zoning Commission members. The Planning and Zoning Commission contains 12 members, eight of which are appointed by the City and four of which are appointed by the County. The North Carolina General Statutes require membership from the extraterritorial jurisdiction to be appointed by the County Commissioners. There are currently only four City boards and/or commissions that have “slotted” positions—Convention and Visitors Authority, Affordable Housing Loan Committee, Environmental Advisory Commission, and the Historic Preservation Commission. The Convention and Visitors Authority and the Affordable Housing Loan Committee “slotted” positions are based upon the resolutions that created the boards and the Historic Preservation Commission positions are “slotted” based upon NC General Statutes.

Mr. Flood continued by stating that the City Clerk’s Office surveyed several North Carolina cities (Asheville, Cary, Concord, Gastonia, Goldsboro, Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Hendersonville, Jacksonville, Lenoir, Monroe, Reidsville, Wake Forest, Wilmington, Burlington and Zebulon), none of which indicated that they slotted the positions of the Planning and Zoning Commission members. Mr. Flood provided the pros and cons for slotting the positions on that particular commission.

#### Pros

- Potential (or perception) of more diverse representation
- Defined and publicly recognized membership method for appointments

#### Cons

- Experience has shown it is harder to fill slotted positions than non-slotted positions.
- There are fewer candidates to choose from if slotted positions are established.
- Slotted positions are difficult to define (i.e., one person may be both a farmer and a developer).
- Slotted membership assignment does not insure individual exercise of specified philosophy.
- Innovation most often results from majority rule that swings to both poles over time; however, in a system of special (group) interest, it may have the reverse effect of advancing mediocrity.

- Slotted members are likely to assume they have been appointed to uphold a specific special interest without regard to their personal judgment or the facts before them.

Mr. Flood stated that staff does not believe that slotting members appointed to the Planning and Zoning Commission will improve the quality of the Commission. He suggested adding a general statement to the purpose of the Rules and Procedures stating that the Commission should be comprised of representatives that represent various interests such as environmentalists, neighborhoods, developers and citizens at large among others.

Mr. Flood concluded by stating that even though it is not a part of Mr. Hamilton's request, the Council may wish to discuss the membership composition of the Commission by changing the number of representatives from the extraterritorial jurisdiction. This is warranted as the current representation from the extraterritorial jurisdiction is 33% of the board. The current population of the city limits is 61,153. An estimated 10,000 people reside in the extraterritorial jurisdiction, which is only 14%. Therefore, it may be preferred to reduce the representation of that area from four members to two.

City Manager Davis referred to the general purpose statement of the Greenville Utilities Commission charter, which states, "It is the intention of this charter that the City Council shall appoint Greenville Utilities Commission members who have utilities expertise. Representation should include some members with financial, engineering, environmental, technical, or development backgrounds."

Upon being asked for the opinion of the Council Members, Council Member Little stated that he liked the general purpose statement, and Council Member Dunn stated that she felt that a diversity of people should be assured. She suggested that some language be written that addresses issues raised.

City Attorney Holec suggested that the staff either bring language back to Council to consider or send it to the Planning and Zoning Commission for recommendation if the language is to be included in an ordinance. Council can then review the recommendation. If it is included as a general statement rather than an ordinance, it is simply a policy and does not require a public hearing.

Motion was made by Council Member Dunn and seconded by Council Member Council to have staff develop the language and bring it back to the City Council for final form to be done in the form of an ordinance to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission and then to the City Council. Staff will bring back a recommendation of diversification of people. Motion carried unanimously.

Council Member Craft suggested looking at the representation from the extraterritorial jurisdiction as was suggested. It was suggested by Mayor Pro-Tem Miller that staff work with the County to reduce the number of County appointments to two.

The City Manager was directed to consult with the County Manager on the issue of reducing the extraterritorial jurisdiction representation on the Planning and Zoning Commission.

## DISCUSSION OF FIRE/RESCUE STATION #6 AND LIMITED TRAINING FACILITIES

City Manager Davis reminded the Council that the contract for architectural services for the planning and design of Fire/Rescue Station #6 was awarded by City Council at the August 11, 2003 City Council meeting. At that time, the City Council instructed staff to present more information at the September 8, 2003 meeting regarding how fire stations are sited, what factors go into the process, and the components of the limited training facilities that may be involved in Station #6.

Chief Roy Spell of Fire/Rescue informed the Council that the basic way that a fire/rescue station is located is response time. When looking at response time, the following is taken into consideration.

- Distance to another station. The Insurance Service Office (ISO) studies state the distance between stations should be within a 1.5 mile radius and the stations should be contiguous to each other. Station Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and proposed Station #6 all meet the ISO regulations regarding overlapping and being contiguous.
- Density/Intensity of buildings and people. The more buildings and more people, the greater the need for protection.
- Thoroughfare access. Thoroughfare access is needed usually in all four directions--north, east, south, and west. The better the access (4 lanes versus 2 lanes) the quicker the response time. Thoroughfare access is available on Highway 33.
- Response time parameters. The desired response time is four minutes or less. The shutting down of bodily functions and also the exponential spread of fire requires a critical response time of four minutes. The equation often given for emergency service is level service + quick response = lives. If the City of Greenville has a goal of a response time of no longer than four minutes, then the times are measured with a stopwatch from one station to another. A stopwatch is used as staff travels to measure time. When arriving at a stop sign or stop light, the stop watch is stopped and when the light changes the stop watch is started again and staff proceeds on to measure the time. Chief Spell further stated that as an example City staff measured time from Fire/Rescue Station #3 located at the corner of Red Banks and Charles Boulevard to the intersection of Prince Road and Valley Lane in Eastwood Subdivision. Staff traveled Red Banks Road to Fourteenth Street to Greenville Boulevard and from Fire/Rescue Station #3 to Eastwood Subdivision it took 4 minutes and 37 seconds. From Fire/Rescue Station #6, which is contiguous with other station sites, to Eastwood Subdivision, it took 3 minutes and 17 seconds. From the proposed Highway 33 site, around the Homestead Cemetery area, to Eastwood Subdivision it took 5 minutes 5 seconds via Tenth Street to Greenville Boulevard.
- Uncovered fire hydrant location. The number of fire hydrants in a district is also used by the ISO to determine the need for a new Fire/Rescue Station location. A fire hydrant means there is a density of people in the area. The City of Greenville has 5 stations and the average for the City's five stations is 1,531. The total number divided by 5 gives 306. ISO regulation is you find one half of your average, which in this area would be 151 hydrants. You find another area in your city that has at least that number of hydrants, and the ISO regulations mandate that you put a station in this district. Station 6 has 240 hydrants in that district. By ISO regulations it calls for a station to be placed in that district.

- Specific site evaluation. These factors include visual access onto the thoroughfare, distance to the other thoroughfare directions, minimum size of the site needed, ability to buffer to adjacent land uses particularly with 7-day/24-hour Fire/Rescue operation, and cost of the site.

Chief Spell further explained that the ISO rates each city as to their capability to fight fire. These numerical ratings are 1 (best coverage) to 10 (lowest coverage). Greensboro is the only city in North Carolina with a number 1 rating. There are no 2 ratings, and Raleigh, High Point, Asheville, Rocky Mount, Wilson and Greenville have a 3 rating. Greenville's last evaluation was in 1995 and according to the ISO Greenville is evaluated every five to seven years. With a population under 100,000 the City of Greenville would fall under the Department of Insurance under their ISO regulations, which will be the group that will come in and inspect the City. Some of the things the ISO will look at when rating the City of Greenville is the water distribution system; the receiving and handling of fire alarms; the number of needed engine companies, locations and personnel; fire engines and ladder trucks; fire equipment; training records and equipment testing records. A neighboring city recently underwent a study and has gone from a Class 3 to a Class 5 rating. Insurance is based on the City's ISO rating. A Class 3 commercial building valued at \$500,000 has an annual insurance premium base rate of \$2,900 and would have a 27% increase in an annual premium of \$3,683 if moved to Class 6 and a 96% increase of \$5,684 if moved to Class 9. A Class 3 residential property valued at \$100,000 has an annual insurance premium base rate of \$493 and would have a 5% increase in an annual premium of \$517.65 if moved to Class 6 and a 35% increase of \$665.55 if moved to Class 9.

Chief Spell informed the City Council that City staff looked at numerous sites before settling on the site at the 3300 block of Tenth Street for Fire/Rescue Station #6. This site was selected because of cost, location and other factors that enabled the City to obtain the 10.5 acres of cleared property along with 60 additional acres of other land that was donated to the City. A typical Fire/Rescue station has two bays for Fire and EMS units, sleeping areas for 18 persons, and support space, all of which would contain 6,300 square feet including the open bay space. Twelve firefighters will be needed to staff Station #6 initially for three shifts. This will be a limited training facility and not a regional training center. Most Fire/Rescue Departments the size of Greenville's have a training center. Greenville presently does not have such a training facility. The City's drill tower is presently located on Skinner Street and was constructed in 1943. The City has received a donation of \$35,000 from Minges/Pepsi for a tower replacement at the new training center site. Also, on the new limited training facility site, staff is looking to have a burn building, which is an area that City staff needs more training. The proposed site will enable training to be held in Greenville rather than sending staff out of town for training. Greenville's present smoke building is a concrete building located on Cemetery Road that has substantial stress cracks in the exterior walls. Repairs have to be done before anyone can be sent back inside for training. Also planned for the limited training site is a pumper test pit that will be used for different purposes such as testing the City's fire engines. Some of Greenville's fire engines cost \$350,000 to \$400,000 and staff has to go to local ponds and different places to test the pumps as mandated by the Insurance Service Office and OSHA. A controlled area is needed so that it is known that there is nothing like bricks or sticks and things like that in the water. Also, a training classroom would be extended onto the proposed station. This will give the City Fire/Rescue Department a limited training facility that Greenville's personnel need.

Council Member Little suggested that it appears that the City needs to be thinking about a

proposed Station 7, and Chief Spell stated that a site had already been identified to go on Fire Tower Road and Evans Street because the number of fire hydrants call for a station to go in that area.

Upon being asked how the City services the high school, Chief Spell replied that Station 5 located on Rollins Drive services the high school.

Mayor Parrott reminded the Council that no action was being taken on this item and was on the agenda for discussion only.

#### DISCUSSION OF CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION PLANS ON ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES BY RICHARD JOHNSON OF THE EAST GROUP

Mr. Richard Johnson of the East Group explained to the Council the process that he and the staff had gone through to date on the construction and renovation plans for the administrative facilities. The Council's involvement is also needed because the Council Members are regular users of the building, and they have special perspectives about the projects that the East Group and staff needs to hear. He asked the Council to think about the Chambers, the things that they like about it and the opportunities for improvement as far as the physical architecture, the seating, interaction with the public, use of monitors, and technology. The City Council's involvement could be enhanced if the group could travel together and visit other facilities that have recently been completed. This has been done with other projects and there are benefits of doing this. Two projects have been identified in Forsyth County, one being a facility nearing completion and another being the City of Winston-Salem facility. These two facilities are fairly close to one another and may be able to fit in another site if it can be worked out. This would be an all day trip from 7:00 am to 7 p.m. The projected completion date for Greenville's administrative facilities is October 2005.

Motion was made by Council Member Little and seconded by Council Member Glover to set September 26, 2003 at 7:00 a.m. as the time and date for visiting other facilities. Motion carried unanimously.

#### UPDATE ON THE COMPUTERIZED TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM

Mr. Steve Yetman, Traffic Engineer, stated that Phase 1 of the computerized traffic signal system has been in operation since July 2002. Phase 1 is composed of 72 intersections with five closed circuit television cameras, which are linked to the central computer system at Public Works. There is also emergency vehicle preemption equipment along Arlington Boulevard. The project cost was \$3.2 million. The total cost break down was \$2.6 million paid by the City of Greenville and \$600,000 paid by the State of North Carolina. Time and plans were developed during the Phase 1 plan and the consultants worked with staff on creating an a.m. peak, mid-day peak and p.m. peak and time and plans for ECU football games. City staff has also developed plans for the Convention Center events and special event plans such as the July 4th celebration. During the Phase 1 part of the traffic signal system, the consultant did a before and after study that evaluated the performance and the four measures of effectiveness: (1) vehicle hours traveled, which is the total amount of hours for vehicles to travel on the corridor; (2) total stop delays, which is the total time for vehicles to be stopped at intersections along the corridor; (3)

fuel consumption, the total number of gallons consumed and (4) the total number of stops along that corridor under that study. The three corridors that were chosen for the before and after study were the Memorial Drive corridor, the Greenville Boulevard corridor and the Arlington Boulevard corridor. The Memorial Drive portion running from Third Street to Fire Tower Road is 4.8 miles long, has 14 signals, high truck traffic and a traffic volume range from 28,000 to 44,000 vehicles a day. The study provided the results of the before and after, showing improvements in vehicle hours traveled, total stop delays and number of stops. A slight decrease in fuel consumption was also shown. The Greenville Boulevard corridor run was from Mall Drive to Elm Street and is composed of 11 signals. It has intersections that are over capacity, meaning the intersections are congested. Greenville Boulevard is a five-lane roadway and there are numerous driveways that affect the operating level of service. The operating speed at times is less than the posted speed limit due to the congestion and volume ranging from 21,000 to 40,000 cars a day. The after study conducted by the consultants showed improvements in vehicle hours traveled, total stop delays, and the number of stops. There was a slight reduction and improvement on fuel consumption. The Arlington Boulevard corridor runs from Red Banks Road to Dickinson Avenue and is 2.4 miles long. There are six signals along the corridor and there was no previous signal coordination prior to the Phase 1. The traffic volumes along the corridor range from 22,000 to 29,000 cars a day. The results of the Arlington Boulevard corridor study showed the biggest improvement and there were also improvements among all the measures of effectiveness.

Mr. Yetman informed the Council of the following negative impacts to the traffic signal system:

- Construction projects such as the resurfacing project this summer on Greenville Boulevard where vehicle protector hoops were ground up by machines and staff was without vehicle detections for a couple of months.
- Intersections being shut down such as Memorial Drive and Dickinson Avenue. Traffic has been re-routed around the area and that adds additional traffic and stress to other nearby signals.
- Greenville Boulevard and Evans Street are in the process of being widened to improve the intersection. Lane closures associated with construction can severely impact capacity and create congestion.
- Accidents can adversely affect the performance of the signal system causing a reaction similar to a lane closure.
- Multiple driveways where cars are turning in and out can cause vehicles to slow down and have a negative impact on the traffic signal system.

The traffic signal system will be a continuous improvement program as staff will need to continually update existing times and plans as construction changes lane configurations and changes in traffic patterns. Other things that staff will be doing is developing time and plans for off peak and holiday periods, developing additional special event times and plans as needed. There will also be a future Memorial Drive/Greenville Boulevard Corridor Study to review ways to improve traffic operation conditions along that corridor.

Mr. Yetman continued by stating that the North Carolina Department of Transportation has been working with staff and the consultant on Phase 2 of the traffic signal project. Forty additional intersections and seven closed circuit TV cameras will be added to Phase 2 of the project. It is

anticipated that construction will begin in March 2004 and will take approximately 18 months to complete the project. The estimated cost is \$4.4 million and is fully funded by the North Carolina Department of Transportation.

Mr. Yetman summarized by informing the Council that staff has found that there is overall reduction in travel time along the City's major corridors and also a reduction in delays at signalized intersections. Staff has also reduced the number of stops along the major corridors. The operation of maintenance provided to the signals has been improved. With the traffic signal system the City is able to adjust traffic signal timings for remote locations, saving time and labor.

City Manager Davis informed the City Council that one of the questions that is often asked is does the computerized traffic signal system work and has it improved traffic flow and based on Mr. Yetman's presentation it shows that is has. The traffic signal system does not solve the problem, but it helps the problem. The project was never designed to be something that completely made traffic congestion go away but to help move traffic through the city.

Mayor Parrott stated that citizens are complaining about having to wait a lot longer on the side streets coming into the thoroughfare, but that cannot be improved if the City is going to improve the traffic flow on the thoroughfares. There has to be a longer wait at the side roads coming into the thoroughfares.

Mr. Yetman explained how if the traffic light is in the system there will be a certain cycle length of time given to Greenville Boulevard or Memorial Drive and it is going to hold up the side street to a certain point. Delays would not be as noticeable on a side street like Arlington Boulevard or Evans Street but a less traveled side street, it would be more noticeable. With the signal system it is to progress the traffic along the corridor, the side streets at times may appear to have a little more delay depending on the time of day.

#### UPDATE ON THE GREENE STREET BRIDGE RELOCATION

Mr. David Brown, City Engineer, informed the City Council that in June 2003 City staff submitted final plans to the North Carolina Department of Transportation as part of the required review process. The State Historic Preservation Office is also reviewing the Green Street Bridge relocation plans. Based upon the State Historic Preservation Office's evaluations thus far, they are requiring additional information. City staff has provided that information and addressed everything that was required by the North Carolina Department of Transportation. City staff is currently waiting on an issue that involves the State Historic Preservation Office's request for the placement of a deck that will span the entire width of the bridge. The original bridge did not have such a deck, and to accommodate that request will require additional modifications to the structure to support the additional load. Currently, staff is trying to address the matter, working with the State Historic Preservation Office. If staff can get this matter addressed then it is hoped that this matter will be back to City Council in December with a potential award of the contract for reconstructing the bridge.



Questions and concerns raised by the City Council and responses are as follows:

- Comment on the walkway that staff has recommended over the bridge and then compare that with what the State Archives and History office has requested (RESPONSE: Staff is recommending a 12-foot wide walkway with benches and look out areas along the span that would provide an opportunity for pedestrians or bicyclist who are utilizing the area to be able to stop, look at the structure and review it and this recommendation would not require any additional modifications to the existing structure. The structure could be used as it was originally designed. To meet the requirements of the State Historic Preservation Office, staff would have to add additional members and trusts to hold the additional weight that would be required to put on a wider deck.)
- At what point in time was City staff aware of this request? (RESPONSE: Staff has to do a preliminary plan submittal that is early in the plans, and that is when this issue came up. Staff responded to it at that time that a 12-foot wide walkway was planned as opposed to the full width. The State Archives and History Department did not respond back, and when staff submitted the final plans in June the State brought this issue back up again. This was never indicated in any of the applications submitted for grants that the City would be doing a full decking of the bridge and it was never indicated by the State that this would have to be done.)
- What will the cost to the City be if a wider deck is required? (RESPONSE: The staff is not sure at this time. The approach that staff is taking is that if the State wants a deck, then the State will pay for it. The City will do what was originally proposed and that is basically the message that has been given to the State and there is no alternative to do it otherwise.)
- The original budget for this project was \$1 million and the Department of Transportation's participation was \$800,000. Of the \$200,000 to be paid by the City, how much has already been spent on engineering? (RESPONSE: Approximately \$60,000. The total contract was for \$80,000, which included the bridge relocation and the Greene Street enhancement project along North Greene Street.)
- Is there a stipulation in the original grant with the North Carolina Department of Transportation that the City had to meet the State Historic Preservation Office's requirements? (RESPONSE: No, but one of the reasons the City was rewarded a grant is because the City was salvaging and restoring a historical structure for an alternative use and not for its original use or not for the use that the State's Historic Preservation Office has described but for an alternative use, which was a pedestrian pathway.)
- Are the plans still to put the bridge over a ditch and not over the river? (RESPONSE: The bridge will go over the Town Creek.)
- Was that location made clear in Raleigh? (RESPONSE: Yes.)
- Can this request be resolved with the Historic Commission? (RESPONSE: It is believed that the issue can be resolved and that a previously cancelled meeting is going to be held as a conference call this Wednesday. If it is still necessary to go to Raleigh, then staff will do that later in the week.)
- Does the City have any financial liabilities if it decided that they did not want to move the bridge but wanted to build its own bridge or walkway? (RESPONSE: The full cost of the monies spent to date on engineering would be the City's responsibility, which, as opposed to an 80/20 share, the City would have to work through the issue of disposing of the bridge from its current location. That was looked at several months ago and the disposal of the bridge could be a very expensive endeavor, possibly as much as the project itself.)

- How wide is Town Creek? (RESPONSE: The bottom of the creek is probably 12 or 15 feet wide and it goes up to about a 30 or 40 foot section, but from the top area there is a very deep ravine on the east side of the creek. From there to the Town Commons it would take 200 feet of that span which is a 200-foot span bridge. Presently there is a feasibility study that is getting ready to begin for the South Tar River Greenway that will extend from the bridge or Town Commons along the south side of the river and join into the Green Mill Run Greenway at Green Springs Park. The Department of Transportation is conducting that feasibility study and is beginning that work now.)
- Are the plans that were submitted to Raleigh the final plans? (RESPONSE: Once staff gets the State's approval on everything, staff will be putting the project out to be processed.)
- Can staff bid this to see how much it is going to cost? (RESPONSE: According to the Municipal Agreement, the City cannot move forward with the bidding phase until the City has authorization from the Department of Transportation, and they will not give it until the State's Historic Preservation Office is satisfied.)
- This is a sore subject because the City of Greenville is working under a tight budget and then puts this kind of money into the bridge when the City has people who are homeless and in need. There are thousands and thousands of people who are jobless and there are working class people who are probably going to be homeless too. It is a waste of taxpayers' money from the State's point of view and the City's. Priorities are being put in the wrong place. (RESPONSE: The decision was made four or five years ago, and the City is already into the project. It is difficult to back out of a project when you are in the middle of it. The City is going to have to look at the costs as they come forward and then make some decisions along the way that might be a lot more intelligent than can be made right now with the present facts.)

City Manager Davis stated the bridge is part of the Greenway Master Plan update and staff is not happy with the situation with the Division of Archives and History. Staff feels like it has delayed the reasonableness of this project and wants the State to see the value of the City's proposal.

#### REVIEW OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2003 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

The Council did a cursory review of the items on the September 11, 2003 City Council Meeting agenda and reviewed the appointments to Boards and Commissions.

#### COMMENTS FROM MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Council Member Glover stated that the Comprehensive Plan open house will be held from 4:00 until 6:00 at the Eppes Center on September 9.

Council Member Council stated that the Police Community Relations Committee will be meeting in District 3 on September 10 at 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller encouraged residents to attend the Police Community Relations Committee meeting at Wahl Coates School at 7:00 p.m. on September 10.

Mayor Pro-Tem Miller encouraged citizens to participate in the Citizens Police Academy. They have an alumni association that continues to be involved even after graduation from the academy.

Council Member Council stated that September is Sickle Cell Month and there was a celebration in Raleigh last Friday.

Council Member Council stated that the Convention and Visitors Authority will meet on Thursday at 5:30 p.m.

Council Member Council asked Mr. Nelms, the Executive Director of Sheppard Memorial Library, to make the hours of operation more prominent so that people can see them before they actually get to the door.

Council Member Dunn thanked Tom Tysinger for having the meetings on traffic calming.

Mayor Parrott reported that Council Member Dunn lost a relative this week.

### CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

#### Indication of subjects coming to City Council in the next three months

City Manager Davis reviewed the listing of issues that may be presented to Council during the next three months:

- Red light camera presentation
- Presentation of the first year of the 45-block CDBG plan
- Authorization of the redevelopment plan contract
- Presentation on City, County, ECU and hospital transit study
- Consideration of the Ferguson Group agreement
- Presentation of the Horizons Comprehensive Plan
- Transportation Plan priorities for NCDOT TIP
- Presentation of the revised Thoroughfare Plan
- Presentation of Annual Audit
- Schematic drawings presentation by Richard Johnson for administrative facilities
- Cemetery ordinance amendments
- City Council installation
- Initial presentation of the Capital Improvement Plan
- Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance amendments
- Greene Street Bridge relocation contract award
- Greene Street to Airport Road Streetscape Enhancement Grant schematics presentation

Asking of the City's interest in purchasing property

City Manager Davis informed the council that Barbara Brown, the owner of the property currently being used as the George Garrett Police Station located at 1032 Fleming Street, has offered to sell the property to the City for \$18,000.

Council Member Glover stated that the community would like to continue having the substation there. Because the school is considering an expansion and will possibly have more students, perhaps the School System would be interested in purchasing it. The presence of the substation is a good thing for the children's safety. The community would love to keep this building. Council Member Glover suggested talking with Pitt County Schools and asking them to go 50/50 or ask them to purchase the entire building. This needs to be kept in the community. Just having the presence helps us move along with revitalization and crime problems in that particular area.

It was suggested that the building be appraised and the tax value obtained and see if it is room for negotiation.

City Manager Davis reminded the Council that there have been discussions in the past about having a mobile police substation that may be similar to a construction office/RV that could be moved from place to place.

Council Member Glover stated that people feel more comfortable with a stable place. The building is used for community meetings, etc. Police officers are there to help them and accommodate them.

City Manager Davis stated that he will look at the School System suggestion.

Mayor Parrott stated that it is a matter of whether the City continues to rent it or buy it.

ADJOURN

Motion was made by Council Member Craft and seconded by Council Member Council to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Wanda T. Elks, CMC  
City Clerk